**EXHIBIT** 

6

# DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF DR. CHRISTOPHER TEAF

05-CV-0329 GKF-PJC

```
1
            IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
2
                   NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
3
4
     W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )
5
     capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )
     OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and )
6
     OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE
     ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
7
     in his capacity as the
     TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
8
     FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
9
                  Plaintiff,
10
                                    )4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ
     vs.
11
     TYSON FOODS, INC., et al,
12
                  Defendants.
13
14
                       THE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
15
     VALERIE HARDWOOD, PhD, produced as a witness on
16
     behalf of the Defendants in the above styled and
17
     numbered cause, taken on the 18th day of July, 2008,
18
     in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State of
19
     Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, a Certified
20
     Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under and by
21
     virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.
22
23
24
25
```

1	A	Correct.	
2	Q	Do you see that? Do you have any notion of	
3	the h	undred thousand individuals who Dr. or	
4	Profes	ssor Caneday identified, any idea how many of	
5	them a	are infants?	10:22AM
6	A	No.	
7	Q	Do you suspect there are many infants going	
8	for f	loats in the Illinois River watershed?	
9		MR. PAGE: Object to the form.	
10	A	I really don't know.	10:23AM
11	Q	Do you have any idea how many of the hundred	
12	thous	and are children?	
13	A	No, I don't.	
14	Q	Pregnant women?	
15	A	No, I don't.	10:23AM
16	Q	Elderly?	
17	A	No, I do not know.	
18	Q	Immunocompromised?	
19	A	No, I don't know.	
20	Q	Let's turn to the notion of bacteria that are	10:23AM
21	in a '	viable but not culturable state, and this is	
22	sometl	hing you discussed and testified about	
23	previ	ously. Viable but not culturable does not mean	
24	undete	ectable; right?	
25	A	Viable but not culturable means undetectable	10:23AM

TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS 918-587-2878

1	by conventional culture methods, but there are other			
2	methods that could potentially be adaptive for			
3	detecting them.			
4	Q They could be detected, for instance, for			
5	DNA-based methods, such as PCR; is that correct? 10:23AM			
6	A That's correct.			
7	Q What are the what are the relative			
8	advantages of doing culturing instead of over			
9	PCR?			
10	A The biggest advantage of well, I guess if 10:23AM			
11	you can clarify that a little bit, so you asked me			
12	what are the biggest advantages of doing culturing			
13	over PCR show. In what context are you referring			
14	to?			
15	Q That's a good question. Which one is faster? 10:24AM			
16	A PCR was faster.			
17	Q Which one is cheaper?			
18	A Oh, that depends on the method. So some kinds			
19	of culture method are cheap and some are not.			
20	Q If the PCR assay is already developed, so 10:24AM			
21	science has been done and it's been verified and			
22	it's known to identify, say, Campylobacter, so			
23	that's all in the box and you pull it off the shelf			
24	and you are going to use it, is it cheaper to do			
25	that or culture? 10:24AM			

1	10 sar	mples from anywhere in the watershed, you would	
2	expect	t to find these same relationships?	
3	A	I would expect to find similar relationships,	
4	not ne	ecessarily the same R squared, but I would	
5	expect	to find a relationship between indicator	02:05PM
6	bacter	ria concentrations and the biomarker.	
7	Q	Okay. Did you perform any calculations as to	
8	how ma	any litter samples you should take to	
9	accura	ately characterize the watershed?	
10	A	No.	02:05PM
11	Q	In the water samples background question.	
12	Poulti	ry is not the only source of indicator bacteria	
13	in sur	rface water in the IRW; correct?	
14	A	Poultry is a dominant source of indicator	
15	bacte	ria in the watershed.	02:05PM
16	Q	I knew you believed that, but there are other	
17	source	es of indicator bacteria?	
18	A	There can be.	
19	Q	There can be?	
20	A	Yes.	02:05PM
21	Q	Okay. Are there?	
22	A	Okay.	
23	Q	Do you think it's possible that poultry is the	
24	only s	source of indicator bacteria in the IRW?	
25	A	Again, poultry are a dominant source but it is	02:06PM

1	possible that there are other sources.
2	Q Well, if they're a dominant source, then there
3	must be other sources. Can we agree there are other
4	sources?
5	A I can agree that there are other sources, yes. 02:06PM
6	Q Thank you. What when you did the
7	correlation here for your paper between PCR sequence
8	and indicator bacteria in the water, did you perform
9	any did you do anything to control for ultimate
10	sources of the indicator bacteria? 02:06PM
11	A We measured the poultry litter biomarker, but
12	we did not have specific microbial source tracking
13	tests for any other species.
14	Q Okay, and so the Enterococcus and the E. coli
15	that are included in this calculation, the 02:06PM
16	correlation in the water, those include all
17	indicator bacteria or all E. coli and all
18	Enterococcus regardless of source?
19	A That would include all E. coli and all
20	Enterococci that were culturable. 02:07PM
21	Q Okay. Did you find the PCR sequence in all of
22	your edge of field samples?
23	A No. I don't think
24	Q You can probably look on Exhibit 12 and it
25	will tell you. 02:07PM